JAY NELKIN, hereby declares, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, as follows:

- 1. I am a member of the law firm of Nelkin & Nelkin, P. C. and am a member in good standing of the State Bar of New York. I am also admitted to practice before the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York, and the United States Courts of Appeal for the Second, Fifth and Federal Circuits. I have personal knowledge of the information set forth herein. I make this declaration in support of my Application for Admission Pro Hac Vice and in response to Defendant's Motion in Opposition to that motion.
- 2. I am a resident of Englewood, New Jersey and do not reside in California. Neither I nor my law firm maintain an office in California. I have never taken or attended a deposition in connection with any California case. I have never physically appeared in person in a California court room. I have never met a client in California in the last 3 years. In fact, I have not physically entered California in the past 3 years other than a single isolated instance when I caught a connecting flight at the Los Angeles Airport during which time I did not leave the airport.
- 3. I was not the sole or primary counsel and never filed an appearance or applied to appear pro hac vice in Jones v. ConAgra Foods, Inc., (3:12-cv-01633-CRB); Bankamerica Corp. v. Bank of New York, et al (3:96-cv-03684-SC); Kosta v. Del Monte Corporation, (4:12-cv-01722-YGR); Maxwell v. Unilever United States, Inc. et al, (5:12-cv-01736-EJD); Avoy v. Sunsweet Growers, Inc., (5:12-cv-01769-RMW); Ogden v. Bumble Bee Foods, LLC, (5:12-cv-01828-LHK); Brazil v. Dole Food Company, Inc. et al, (5:12-cv-01831-LHK); Gustavson v. Wrigley Sales Company et al, (5:12-cv-01861-LHK); Khasin v. The Hershey Company, (5:12-cv-01862-EJD); Samet v. Proctor and Gamble Company, (5:12-cv-01891-PSG); United States of America et al v. Coca-Cola Company (3:13-cv-02551-JCS) and Trazo v. Nestle USA, Inc. et al, (5:12-cv-02272-PSG). To the extent my name was on listed on any pleadings it was as part of a group listing of attorneys and firms in which other firms and lawyers besides me were responsible for representing the clients. Such listing did not reflect my "appearance" in the case but was merely to reflect that I was providing supporting services to the in-state attorney and any other

attorneys admitted in the case. With the exception of *United States of America et al v. Coca-Cola Company* (3:13-cv-02551-JCS), I never met, spoke with or communicated with the clients in these cases nor did I have any contact with opposing counsel in any of these cases. I never met, spoke with or communicated with opposing counsel in *United States of America et al v. Coca-Cola Company* (3:13-cv-02551-JCS) and only met the client in that case outside of California after it was dismissed.

- 4. My role in *Bankamerica Corp. v. Bank of New York, et al,* (3:96-cv-03684-SC) was limited and terminated nearly 18 years ago in 1997 when I was an associate at Sullivan & Cromwell. The *Lazaroff v. Ferrellgas, L.P. et al.,* (2:09-cv-04274-PSG-SS) and *Yunis et al v. Ferrellgas, L.P. et al.,* (3:09-cv-03093-THE) cases were transferred out of California in 2009.
- 5. In the last 3 years I have not argued before a Court in any California case or filed an appearance form. Except for this case, I have not filed an application to be admitted *pro hac vice* in any case in California. In the last 3 years I have always filtered my work in any case filed in California through an in-state attorney. Over the past 3 years, my activities in connection with any California cases have been limited to activities conducted outside the borders of California such as reviewing pleadings, researching relevant law, and advising co-counsel.
- 6. I sought *pro hac vice* status in this case out of an abundance of caution to ensure that I, although working outside of California, could review and assess the voluminous documents produced in this case by Defendant pursuant to a protective Order.
- 7. I filed an application to appear *pro hac vice* in this case on January 8, 2015, indicating that I agreed to abide by the rules of this Court. Ben F. Pierce Gore, a member of the Bar of this Court, was designated as my co-counsel in my *pro hac vice* application. I meet all the criteria for *pro hac vice* admission identified by this Court in *Santiago v. Equable Ascent Fin.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 97762 at *13 n.3. (N.D. Cal. July 12, 2013).
- 8. As indicated above, I do not reside in the State of California. I have not officially registered to take the California State Bar exam and I am not awaiting the results from the California State Bar exam. I have not regularly engaged in the practice of law in California in the last 3 years. I did not sign briefs, did not argue cases, and always filtered any work in

Case 4:13-cv-01196-HSG Document 99-1 Filed 01/13/15 Page 4 of 4